DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 187 809 UD 020 613

AUTHOR	Proper, Elizabeth C.; St. Pierre, Robert G.
TITLE	A Search for Potential New Follow Through Approaches: Executive Summary.
INSTITUTION	Abt Associates, Inc. Cambridge, Mass.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Office of Evaluation and Dissemination.
PUB DATE	Feb 80
CONTRACT	HEW-300-78-0443
NOTE	31p.; Some tables may be marginally legible due to small print. For related documents see UD 020 610-614.
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Disadvantaged Youth; *Educational Methods; Educational Research; Evaluation Criteria; Methods Research; Primary Education; Program Descriptions; *Program Design; *Program Evaluation; *Program Implementation
IDENTIFIERS	*Follow Through

ABSTRACT

This paper summarizes a report on a search for potential new educational approaches and assesses the readiness of these approaches to be implemented within Follow Through (FT) programs. Evaluation of potential FT sponsoring agencies focused on program implementation and maintenance, rather than on effectiveness in improving student outcomes. Three types of approaches were studied: home-based, special populations, and school-based. Eighteen potential sponsors were selected for in-depth study. They represented three basic approaches to education: behaviorist, cognitive developmental, and psychodynamic. Agencies were evaluated in terms of program base, targeted special populations, number of years in operation, targeted age/grade groups, institutional type, and validation by the Joint Dissemination Review Panel of the Educational Division of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Readiness of potential sponsors to implement FT programs was assessed through studies of programs currently being sponsored by the agencies. Abstracts of current programs are included. (MK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED187809

ABT ASSOCIATES INC.
55 WHEELER STREET, CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS 02138
TELEPHONE • AREA 617-492-7100
TWX: 710-3201382

A Search for Potential New Follow Through Approaches:

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

by

Elizabeth C. Proper
Robert G. St.Pierre

February 1980

Contract No. HEW-300-78-0443
Examination of Alternatives for
Follow Through Experimentation

Prepared for:

Burma H. Hulten, Project Officer
The Office of Evaluation and
Dissemination
U.S. Office of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

UD 020613

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Table of Contents

	Page
Purpose of the Study	1
Recommendations for Enhancing Future Implementation in Follow Through	1
The Search for New Approaches	3
Summary of Potential New Follow Through Approaches	9
Potential Sponsors: An Assessment of Their Readiness for Implementation and Abstracts of Their Approaches	13
Abstracts of Home-Based Approaches	17
Abstracts of School-Based Approaches Targeted to Special Populations	19
Abstracts of School-Based Approaches Serving Disadvantaged Children	23

List of Figures

Figure 1:	Components Essential to Implementation of an Educational Approach in Follow Through	2
Figure 2:	Types of Recommendations	3
Figure 3a.	Program Characteristics: Sponsor-Related Recommendations	4
Figure 3b.	Implementation Strategies: Sponsor-Related Recommendations	5
Figure 3c.	Program Characteristics: USOE-Related Recommendations	6
Figure 3d.	Implementation Strategies: USOE-Related Recommendations	7
Figure 4:	Potential New Follow Through Approaches	10
Figure 5:	Summary of Potential New Sponsor's Readiness for Implementation on Each Program Characteristic	14
Figure 6:	Summary of Potential New Sponsor's Readiness for Implementation on Each Implementation Strategy	15

MAY 9 1980

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

In preparation for the possibility of initiating new Follow Through research the U.S. Office of Education (USOE) awarded a contract to Abt Associates Inc. to conduct a search for potential new educational approaches and to assess the readiness of these approaches to be implemented in Follow Through. Specific tasks of the study included:

- a review of Follow Through and other implementation literature to identify characteristics that appear to be essential to the implementation of an educational approach in Follow Through;
- discussions with current Follow Through sponsor and district personnel to learn their views on essential characteristics of a Follow Through approach and to discuss their insights into problems involved in implementing educational approaches in Follow Through;
- a search for potential new approaches through discussions with staff members at USOE and at other federal education agencies, and a letter to heads of departments of education and home economics at colleges and universities throughout the United States;
- the selection of 18 new approaches that might be appropriate for implementation in Follow Through; and
- an assessment of the readiness of those approaches for implementation based on study of their literature and interviews with their key staff.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ENHANCING FUTURE IMPLEMENTATION IN FOLLOW THROUGH

In order to assess the readiness of an approach to be implemented in Follow Through it was first necessary to identify a set of components essential to the existence of a Follow Through approach. Figure 1 presents these components.

Based on the input of sponsor and district "expert witnesses," we have developed specific recommendations in four areas for activities that should be conducted in order to enhance implementation of these components. The cells of Figure 2 define these four areas.

Figure 1

Components Essential to Implementation of an Educational Approach in Follow Through

PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS

Curriculum and Materials: Curriculum content, the media (written, vocal, visual) proposed for transmitting that content, and the presentation order of the content for each subject area.

Organizational Structure: Physical, temporal, and staffing arrangements.

Role/Behavior: The roles, behaviors, and role relationships appropriate for administrative and instructional staff, for parents, and other community members.

Knowledge and Understanding: The degree to which those who are involved in implementing the approach need to know and understand the philosophy, values, and assumptions underlying the approach, as well as the approach's objectives, subject matter, behaviors, and implementation strategies.

Specificity and Evaluability of Objectives: Major objectives and methods to measure them.

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

USOE/Sponsor/District Relationships: The nature of the relationships that exist among the three parties involved in the implementation of a Follow Through approach.

Training: Procedures and strategies developed in order to train administrative and instructional staff, as well as parents and others who may participate in the program.

Evaluation: The approach to obtaining feedback from districts and plans for conducting formative and summative evaluations.

Figure 2

Types of Recommendations

	Pre-Orientation	Orientation
Sponsor-controlled	1) activities that potential new sponsor should conduct prior to entering a formal agreement with a school district	2) activities that potential new sponsors should be prepared to conduct dur- each district's orientation period
USOE-controlled	3) activities that USOE should undertake prior to a sponsor's contact with a district	4) activities that USOE should undertake during a sponsor/district orientation period

Our assessments of readiness for implementation presented later are based on recommendations in the first group. These recommendations pertain specifically to elements of a potential sponsor's approach that need to be in place prior to initiating contact with a school district. Recommendations in the other three areas are targeted to activities that a potential sponsor should conduct during their initial orientation meetings with a district, or to activities that USOE should conduct in order to enhance the sponsor/district relationship. The latter recommendations assume a potential sponsor has sufficiently completed all activities related to pre-orientation to be ready for activities in groups 2, 3 and 4.

Figures 3a through 3d summarize our sponsor-related and USOE-related recommendations for program characteristics and implementation strategies.

THE SEARCH FOR NEW APPROACHES

In our search for potential new approaches, USOE requested that we we restrict our search to sponsors with approaches that met the following criteria:*

- an operational approach with a focus on the education of children, preferably in at least one of the grades from kindergarten through third grade;

*In general, these criteria were set based on USOE's desire to avoid the high development costs incurred by many of the current Follow Through sponsors. The intent of the present project was to search for sponsors with "well-developed" approaches.

Figure 3a. Program Characteristics: Sponsor-Related Recommendations

PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS		SPONSOR-RELATED RECOMMENDATIONS	
		Pre-Orientation	Orientation
Curriculum and Materials	– Curriculum Materials	• Sponsors should either have their own prepared textbooks and curriculum materials or should provide guidelines for their selection. • Sponsors who have their own prepared textbooks and materials should determine whether their use is negotiable. • Sponsors who provide guidelines should compile a list of published materials that meet those guidelines.	• Sponsors who have their own materials should review them in orientation sessions with district personnel. • Sponsors who provide guidlines should review the district's current materials to determine what program or materials modifications are needed to meet the guidelines. • Sponsors should work with district personnal to make any necessary modifications to the district's current materials.
	–Lesson Preparation	• All sponsors, including those who do not require specific curriculum materials, should prepare sufficient lesson plans and other classroom materials for at least one academic year of lessons, for teachers to use while they are learning to implement new teaching behaviors.	
Organizational Structure	–Number and Location of Districts		
	–Number and Location of Classrooms and Schools within Districts		
	–Modification of District Regulations		• Sponsors should negotiate concerns about having districts provide funds for Follow Through children from multiple programs with district and USOE staff.
	–Classroom Organization	• Sponsors should have a plan to phase in classroom change, rather than try to invoke immediate large-scale change.	• Sponsors should be explicit in orientation sessions and in introductory materials as to how their approach fits into or changes the school day and how changes will be phased in. • Sponsors should work with district staff to tailor the phase-in plan to the district's needs.
Role/Behavior	–Sponsor Staff	• Sponsors should develop a staffing plan that defines district representatives as being full-time (if possible) sponsor staff members -- not consultants -- and as having extensive teaching experience. • Sponsors should prepare materials for training district representatives in all aspects of the approach and should conduct the training.	
	–District Staff	• Sponsors should delineate the specific types of staff staff roles required at the district level. • Sponsors should specify which of these roles are critical and which are negotiable.	
	–Additional Adults in the Classroom	• Sponsors should specify the roles of additional adults in the classroom.	• Sponsors with approaches that require additional adults in the classroom, especially in instructional roles, should address the general concerns that this practice can raise among teachers, unions, district administrators, and the community at large. • Sponsors should assist the district in developing a strategy to help third and fourth grade teachers smooth the Follow Through to non-Follow Through transition process.
Knowledge/ Understanding of the Sponsor's Approach by District Staff		• Sponsors should develop materials and techniques to instill knowledge and understanding of their approach into as broad a cross section of the district's educational community as possible. These materials should emphasize practical examples and minimize jargon.	
Specificity and Evaluability of Objectives		• Sponsors should specify in detail their short-term and long-term objectives.	• Sponsors should work with district personnel to assess the congruence between sponsor and district objectives and to reach a compromise where differences exist.

Figure 3b. Implementation Strategies: Sponsor-Related Recommendations

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES		SPONSOR-RELATED RECOMMENDATIONS	
		Pre-Orientation	Orientation
USOE/Sponsor/District Relationship	–Role of USOE		
	–Sponsor/District Interaction	•Sponsors should have a plan for continuously re-assessing their approach's objectives and the methods for meeting those objectives in light of the district's evolving needs and concerns. •A sponsor whose educational approach encompasses the whole child during the entire school day should prepare training materials for Follow Through coordinators, teachers, and district providers to help them function cooperatively.	•Sponsors should involve representatives of all key participants groups in initial orientation sessions. •Beginning with the first contact, sponsors should review with district personnel their plans for continual assessment of approach objectives and methods in light of the district's changing needs. •At orientation sessions, sponsors should review with district personnel their plans for continual assessment of approach objectives and methods in light of the district's changing needs. •During orientation sessions, sponsors should make clear the extent to which their approach requires or encourages coordination with other service providers to potential districts.
Training		•Sponsors should prepare materials for pre- and in-service training that: address all essential features of the approach and their inter-relationships; focus on both the philosophy of the approach and its practical applications; and minimize jargon. •Preservice and inservice training materials should be developed for all those who will be affected by Follow Through (e.g.; principals, teachers, aides, parents, etc.) •Training plans should include both sponsor and district staff as trainers. •Sponsors should develop plans for extensive pre-service training prior to startup of classroom activities; pre-service training for teachers who enter the program during the school year; formal in-service training at the beginning of and during the school year; and informal inservice activities throughout the school year.	•Preservice training should include a visit to the sponsor's lab school or to some classroom where the sponsor's approach is already implemented.
Evaluation	–Measure Development	•Sponsors who believe that their approaches should be evaluated on the basis of outcomes not measured by standardized achievement tests should negotiate this concern with USOE. •If sponsor-specific objectives are to be evaluated, sponsors need to select/develop appropriate measures.	
	–Formative and Summative Evaluation Plans	•Sponsors should develop explicit mechanisms for eliciting feedback from their districts as to the efficacy of their work in all areas.	•Sponsors should work out their plans for evaluation in conjunction with district, state, and USOE requirements.

Figure 3c. Program Characteristics: USOE-Related Recommendations

PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS		USOE-RELATED RECOMMENDATIONS	
		Pre-Orientation	Orientation
Curriculum and Materials	–Curriculum Materials –Lesson Preparation	•USOE should define the extent of within-sponsor cross-site similarity necessitated by their research plans.	•USOE should review any district-specific planned modifications to a sponsor's approach to assure that they do not exceed USOE-imposed limits.
Organizational Structure	–Number and Location of Districts	•USOE should require that sponsors add districts in a gradual pattern like the following: (a) begin in one district in the first year of Follow Through implementation; (b) add one or two more districts in the second year of Follow Through implementation; and (c) work up to a minimum of five and a maximum of seven to fourteen districts in the next one to three years. •USOE should consider the concept of regional sponsors.	
	–Number and Location of Classrooms and Schools within Districts		•USOE should encourage participating districts to commit themselves to establishing all K-3 classrooms within a given school as Follow Through classrooms. •USOE should encourage districts to permit both staff & children to transfer to non-Follow Through classrooms. •USOE should encourage districts to implement Follow Through in schools with the highest degree of geographical concentration as possible.
	–Modification of District Regulations		•The USOE program officer should work with the sponsor and the district as they negotiate which district rules and regulations need to be modified in order for the approach to be implemented within within the district.
	–Classroom Organization		
Role/Behavior	–Sponsor Staff		
	–District Staff		•USOE should encourage districts to make the Follow Through project coordinator position equal to that of a building principal. •In districts where the project coordinator has not been identified prior to sponsor selection, USOE should encourage the district and the sponsor to work together in setting selection criteria.
	–Additional Adults in the Classroom		•USOE should require that professional and para-professional staff participation within Follow Through at the district level be voluntary.
Knowledge/ Understanding of the Sponsor's Approach by District Staff			
Specificity and Evaluability of Objectives		• As a precondition to funding, USOE should review a sponsor's goals and objectives to ascertain that they reflect USOE's goals and objectives for the program. • As a precondition to funding, USOE should make an assessment of the evaluability of the sponsor's approach.	

Figure 3d. Implementation Strategies: USOE-Related Recommendations

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES		USOE-RELATED RECOMMENDATIONS	
		Pre-Orientation	Orientation
USOE/Sponsor/District Relationships	—Role of USOE	• USOE program officers should be assigned to specific sponsors and their associated districts rather to regions of the country. • USOE should develop plans whereby USOE, sponsor, and district staff meet in annual three-party negotiations to set forth their mutual roles for the following year.	
	—Sponsor/District Interaction	• USOE should consider having an impartial person or group meet with each new district to discuss the potential advantage and disadvantages of participating in a Follow Through program. • USOE should permit a "no-fault divorce" between a sponsor and a district for up to a year after formal adoption.	
Training		• USOE should assess whether its objectives can best be met by having sponsors retain primary responsibility for training or by having districts assume it as soon as feasible.	
Evaluation	—Measure Development	• USOE should review its criteria for assessing the attainment of its goals and objectives for Follow Through.	
	—Formative and Summative Evaluation Plans	• USOE should review the extent to which adequate measures are available to evaluate each potential approach. If adequate measures are not available, USOE should either provide the resources for measure development or make it clear to the sponsor that certain objectives will not be measured.	

- some experience in implementing the approach;
- a willingness to modify the approach so that it conforms to Follow Through regulations;
- a willingness to implement the approach in new districts; and
- an ability to specify clearly the approach goals and objectives.

Using these criteria as an initial screen for selecting approaches, we have been concerned with whether or not an approach can be put in place and maintained, not with the effectiveness of the approach in improving student outcomes. Requiring proven program effectiveness as a criterion would have greatly narrowed the scope of our search, and might have precluded consideration of several promising approaches which did not have evaluation data.

Our initial outreach efforts to colleges and universities, federal agencies, and to colleagues in the Follow Through community yielded a total of 58 expressions of interest in Follow Through sponsorship. In conjunction with USOE, we selected 18 (31%) of the 58 applicants for intensive study according to a second set of general criteria. Approaches were more likely to be selected if:

(1) they have had substantial implementation experience;
(2) they need a minimum of program development; and
(3) they have been implemented in the K-3 grade range.

In addition, USOE was particularly interested in including home-based approaches that focus on parents as educators and approaches targeted to the education of children from special populations (e.g. bilingual, handicapped). In order to facilitate the inclusion of these groups we were less strict in applying the above criteria to them than to school-based approaches. The table below shows that, in order to be selected, approaches falling into the latter group had to have been implemented in all of the Follow Through grades, while home-based or special population approaches only had to be implemented in one of the Follow Through grades.

Type of Approach	Number Selected	Target Grades	Implementation Experience	Approach Focus
Home-Based	3	K-3	At least one grade	Primary focus on parents as educators of their children
Special Populations	6	K-3	At least one grade	Primary focus on in-school education of children from special populations
School-Based	9	K-3	Grades K-3	Primary focus on in-school education of disadvantaged children

SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL NEW FOLLOW THROUGH APPROACHES

Each of the 18 potential new sponsors was visited to discuss his/her approach and to make an initial assessment of the approach's readiness for implementation in Follow Through.

Educational Orientation. The 18 potential sponsors selected for intensive study (see Figure 4) represent a wide variety of approaches to education. However, they do not appear to provide any new "visions" to the education of disadvantaged children. As is the case with the current Follow Through sponsors, there is no scheme that can be used to categorize the basic educational orientation of each potential new sponsor. However, ten of the potential new approaches can usefully be categorized in accordance with White et al. (1973) and their discussion of three basic approaches to education: behavioristic, cognitive developmental, and psychodynamic:

- the behavioristic approach maintains that all behaviors are learned, and that skills must be taught to the child using appropriate instructional techniques to attain specified behavioral objectives:
  - Child, Youth and Family Services (DEAL)
  - Ohio State University (Directive Teaching)
- the cognitive developmental approach emphasizes the process of cognitive growth more than the learning of specific content. Instructional techniques vary, but the child's self-guided activities and experimentation with various aspects of the environment are seen as important:
  - Antioch-New England
  - Early Recognition Intervention Network (ERIN)
  - University of Illinois (PEECH)
  - University of Minnesota (PBEC)
  - Virginia Commonwealth University (Developmental Instruction)

Figure 4

Potential New Follow Through Approaches

Institution	Home/ School Based	Targeted to a Special Population	Number of Years in Operation	JDRP Validated?	Target Group: Ages/Grades	Type of Institution	Comments
Appalachia Educ. Lab. (HOPE-II), WV	Home	---	11	---	/K-1	Regional Ed. Lab	Home-based program
Brigham Young University, UT	Home	---	3	---	/K	University	Home-based program
Cooperative Educ. Service Agency 12 (Portage), WI	Home	Handicapped	10	Yes	1-6/	Private Organization	Home-based program
Central Institute for the Deaf, MO	School	Handicapped	21	Yes	0-6/	Private Organization	For deaf children, strong parent component
Child, Youth and Family Services (DEAL), CA	School	Handicapped	8	---	3-9/	Private Organization	Highly structured classroom activities
Early Recognition Intervention Network (ERIN), MA	School	Handicapped	11	Yes	/K-2	Private Organization	Matches child needs to appropriate educational program
Governor's State University, IL	School	Bilingual	0	---	/	University	Not implemented, included because of bilingual focus
Illinois, University of (PEECH), IL	School	Handicapped	9	Yes	3-8/	University	Comprehensive, language-based program
Ohio State University (Directive Teaching), OH	School	Handicapped	9	---	/K-3	University	Structured, emphasizes skills attainment
Antioch-New England, NH	School	---	7	---	/PK-3	University	Modeled after British Infant Schools, cognitive developmental
Carbondale New School, IL	School	---	5	---	/K-3	Private School	Emphasizes socio-emotional development
Central Washington University, WA	School	---	8	---	3-8/	University	Language experience approach
Los Angeles Unified School District (LBC), CA	School	---	10	---	/K-3	LEA	Self-sponsored FT district, linguistics approach
Minnesota, University of (PBEC), MN	School	---	3	---	/K-3	University	Emphasizes problem-solving, cognitive development
Monongalia County Board of Education, WV	School	---	10	---	/K-3	LEA	Self-sponsored FT district, emphasizes reading
New York, State University at Oswego (CAM), NY	School	---	6	---	/K-8	LEA/University	Diagnostic-prescriptive , approach, mastery learning
Nova University, FL	School	---	1	---	/PK-12	University	Child-centered program
Virginia Comm. University (Developmental Instruction), VA	School	---	1	---	/K-6	University	Emphasizes teacher training, eclectic

- The psychodynamic approach considers socioemotional goals to be essential for optimal development of the "whole" child. Instructional techniques emphasize the quality of interpersonal relationships and an environment which supports self-actualization. Examples are:

  - Carbondale New School
  - Central Washington University
  - Nova University

Home vs. School Base. In some respects the aggregate of 18 potential new sponsors closely resembles the current Follow Through sponsors. For example, three of the 18 potential sponsors have home-based approaches (Appalachia Educational Laboratory (HOPE-II), Brigham Young University, and the Cooperative Educational Service Agency (Portage)), as do three of the 19 current sponsors (Clark College, Georgia State University, and the University of North Carolina).

Target Group. On the other hand, when taken in the aggregate, the approaches of the potential new sponsors place a much greater emphasis on the provision of services to special populations than do the approaches of the current sponsors. Seven of the 18 potential new sponsors have approaches that are targeted to special populations while only two of the current approaches (the University of California at Santa Cruz, and the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory) have this basic orientation. This difference occurred at least in part because of USOE's interest in targeted programs, an interest that is evidenced by the inclusion of the Governor's State University approach to bilingual education. If USOE had not been especially interested in bilingual approaches, the Governor's State approach would have been excluded due to a lack of implementation experience.

Amount of Experience. The amount of experience of the 18 potential new sponsors selected for intensive study reflects the requirement we imposed that potential sponsors have some implementation experience. Thirteen of the 18 potential sponsors have five or more years of experience, while only one (Governor's State) has no experience (see the table below). It should be noted that all six of the approaches targeted at handicapped children are in the experienced group. While such approaches were probably available at the inception of Follow Through, it is likely that they did not fit into Follow Through's mission at that time.

Years of Experience	Number of Potential Sponsors
12 or more years	1
5-11 years	12
1-4 years	4
0 years	1
Total	18

Institutional Affiliation. A final distinction between the current and the potential new sponsors is the difference in institutional affiliation (see the table below). Both groups of sponsors are primarily university-based and have some representation from private organizations. The groups differ, though, in that three of the current sponsors have regional educational laboratory affiliations while none are based at the local level.* This situation is reversed for the potential new sponsors where but one is laboratory-based and three or four are based within local educational agencies or private schools. One of these is jointly sponsored by the Oswego School District and the State University of New York at Oswego. Two other locally-based potential new sponsors are currently operating self-sponsored Follow Through programs and would like to move beyond implementation in their own district. The fourth locally-based potential sponsor operates a private school. We see sponsors who are based at the local level (distinguished from self-sponsorship) as providing a potentially important new direction for Follow Through. It is possible that such sponsors have a better appreciation for the problems of working within

Type of Institution	Current Sponsors	Potential Sponsors
University or College	13	9 or 10**
Laboratory or Center	3	1
Private Organization	3	4
LEA/Private School	0*	3 or 4**
Total	19	18

school districts than sponsors whose base of operations is at a university or research laboratory.

---

*While some current Follow Through districts are self-sponsored, our study has concentrated on external sponsorship. Self-sponsored districts do not meet this criterion in that their approaches have been developed mainly for use in their own school district, rather than for the purpose of implementation in other locations.

**One approach is jointly sponsored by the State University of New York and the Oswego Public Schools.

JDRP Validation. Although we did not set out to gather information on the effectiveness of potential new sponsors at achieving their objectives, it should be noted that four of the 18 potential new approaches have been validated by the Joint Dissemination Review Panel in the Education Division of HEW. Each of the validated approaches is targeted to the delivery of services to handicapped children.

POTENTIAL SPONSORS: AN ASSESSMENT OF THEIR READINESS FOR IMPLEMENTATION AND ABSTRACTS OF THEIR APPROACHES

This section concludes our report by bringing together two key sets of information: a brief description of each of the 18 potential new sponsor's approaches and an assessment of each approach's readiness for implementation. The abstracts are ordered alphabetically within the same three groups that were used to select approaches for intensive study:

- home-based approaches;
- approaches targeted to children in special populations (handicapped, bilingual); and
- school-based approaches targeted to the general population of disadvantaged children.

Figures 5 and 6 summarize (for program characteristics and implementation strategies, respectively) our assessment of each potential new sponsor's readiness for implementation. The work/activities suggested by these recommendations are under the control of a sponsor and occur prior to a sponsor and district making any agreements about working together. The cells of the figures contain one of three symbols signifying different levels of readiness for implementation:

● The work the sponsor has done in this area should be sufficient to begin to implement in Follow Through.

◒ The sponsor has done some work in this area but needs to do more prior to implementation in Follow Through.

○ The sponsor has done little or no work in this area.

-- The recommendation is not applicable to the approach. For example, some of the recommendations related to curriculum and materials are not applicable to the home-based approaches.

Figure 5

Summary of Potential New Sponsor's Readiness for Implementation on Each Program Characteristic

PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS		Sponsor-Related Recommendations	Home-Based: Appalachia Ed. Lab (RAPE-II)	Home-Based: Brigham Young University	Home-Based: Coop. Ed. Service Agency (Portage)	Special Populations: Central Inst. for the Deaf	Special Populations: Child, Youth and Family Services (DCAL)	Special Populations: Early Recognition & Intervention Network (ERIN)	Special Populations: Governor's State University	Special Populations: U. of Illinois (PEECH)	Special Populations: Ohio State University (Directive Teaching)	School-Based: Antioch, New England	School-Based: Carbondale New School	School-Based: Central Washington University	School-Based: Los Angeles School District (LSC)	School-Based: University of Minnesota (PREC)	School-Based: Monongalia County Follow Through	School-Based: SUNY/Oswego (CNM)	School-Based: NOVA University	School-Based: Virginia Comm. University (Developmental Instruction)
Curriculum and Materials	Curriculum Materials	Sponsors should either have their own prepared textbooks and curriculum materials or should provide guidelines for their selection.	○	◒	◒	●	○	◒	○	◒	◒	●	○	●	◒	—	◒	◒	◒	○
		Sponsors who have their own prepared textbooks and materials should determine whether their use is negotiable.	—	○	—	—	—	—	○	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Sponsors who provide guidelines should compile a list of published materials that meet those guidelines.	○	—	◒	—	○	○	○	◒	◒	◒	○	○	○	—	○	◒	○	○
	Lesson Preparation	All sponsors, including those who do not require specific curriculum materials, should prepare sufficient lesson plans and other classroom materials for at least one academic year of lessons for teachers to use while they are learning to implement new teaching behaviors.	●	○	◒	●	●	◒	○	◒	●	◒	○	○	●	◒	◒	●	◒	○
Organizational Structure	Classroom Organization	Sponsors should have a plan to phase in classroom change, rather than try to invoke immediate large-scale change.	—	—	—	—	○	●	○	◒	○	●	○	○	●	●	●	—	○	○
Role and Behavior	Sponsor Staff	Sponsors should develop a staffing plan that defines district representatives as being full-time (if possible) sponsor staff members--not consultants, and as having extensive teaching experience.	●	○	●	●	○	●	○	●	●	●	○	●	○	●	●	●	○	●
		Sponsors should prepare materials for training district representatives in all aspects of the approach and should conduct the training.	○	○	●	●	○	●	○	◒	●	○	○	○	○	◒	○	○	○	●
	District Staff	Sponsors should delineate the specific types of staff roles required at the district level.	●	◒	●	●	●	●	◒	●	●	●	○	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
		Sponsors should specify which of these roles are critical and which are negotiable.	●	●	○	○	○	●	○	●	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	●	○	○
	Additional Adults in the Classroom	Sponsors should specify the roles of additional adults in the classroom.	●	●	○	●	●	—	○	●	●	●	◒	●	●	●	●	—	●	●
Knowledge/ Understanding	---	Sponsors should develop materials and techniques to instill knowledge and understanding of their approach into as broad a cross-section of the district's educational community as possible. These materials should emphasize practical examples and minimize jargon.	●	◒	◒	●	◒	◒	○	◒	◒	○	○	○	●	●	○	○	○	●
Specificity and Evaluability of Objectives	---	Sponsors should specify in detail their short-term and long-term objectives.	●	◒	●	●	◒	●	◒	◒	●	◒	◒	◒	◒	◒	◒	●	◒	●

KEY:

- ● Work in this area is sufficient to begin implementation.
- ◒ Some, but not enough work has been done in this area.
- ○ Little or no work has been done in this area.
- — Not applicable.

Figure 6

Summary of Potential New Sponsor's Readiness for Implementation on Each Implementation Strategy

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES		Sponsor-Related Recommendations	Home-Based			Special Populations						School-Based								
			Appalachia Ed. Lab (HOME-ii)	Brigham Young University	Coop. Ed. Service Agency (Portage)	Central Inst. for the Deaf	Child, Youth and Family Services (DEAL)	Early Recognition & Intervention Network (ERIN)	Governor's State University	U. of Illinois (PERCH)	Ohio State University (Directive Teaching)	Antioch, New England	Carbondale New School	Central Washington University	Los Angeles School District (LBC)	University of Minnesota (PRIME)	Monongalia County Follow Through	SUNY/Oswego (CAM)	NOVA University	Virginia Comm. University (Developmental Instruction)
USOE/Sponsor/ District Relationships	Sponsor/ District Interaction	Sponsors should have a plan for continuously reassessing their approach's objectives and methods for meeting those objectives in light of the district's evolving needs and concerns.	○	○	○	—	○	●	○	○	○	●	○	○	◒	○	○	●	○	○
		A sponsor whose educational approach encompasses the whole child during the entire school day should prepare training materials for FT coordinators, teachers, and district providers to help them function cooperatively.	●	—	—	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	—	○	○
Training	—	Sponsors should prepare materials for pre- and inservice training that: address all essential features of the approach and their inter-relationships; focus on both the philosophy of the approach and practical applications; and minimize jargon.	●	○	◒	●	◒	●	◒	◒	●	○	○	○	●	○	◒	○	○	●
		Preservice and inservice training materials should be developed for all those who will be affected by FT (e.g., principals, teachers, aides, parents, etc.).	●	◒	◒	●	◒	●	◒	◒	●	◒	○	○	●	○	◒	○	○	●
		Training plans should include both sponsor and district staff as trainers.	●	◒	●	—	○	●	○	●	●	◒	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	●
		Sponsors should develop plans for extensive pre-service training prior to startup of classroom activities; preservice training for teachers who enter the program during the school year; formal inservice training at the beginning of and during the school year; and informal inservice activities ongoing throughout the school year.	●	●	◒	●	◒	◒	○	◒	●	●	○	○	●	○	◒	○	○	●
Evaluation	Measure Development	Sponsors who expect that their approaches will be evaluated on the basis of outcomes not measured by standardized achievement tests should negotiate this concern with USOE.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
		If sponsor-specific objectives are to be evaluated, sponsors need to select/develop appropriate materials.	●	◒	◒	●	●	●	○	●	●	○	○	◒	●	○	●	●	●	●
	Formative and Summative Evaluation Plans	Sponsors should develop explicit mechanisms for eliciting feedback from their districts as to the efficacy of their work in all areas.	○	◒	○	●	○	○	○	●	○	◒	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	●

KEY:

● Work in this area is sufficient to begin implementation.

◒ Some, but not enough work has been done in this area.

○ Little or no work has been done in this area.

— Not applicable.

By scanning down any given column, the reader can obtain a rough indication of the amount of development work that a potential sponsor has done and the amount remaining. It should be noted that none of the potential sponsors fully meets all of our recommendations. A range of factors enters into an explanation of why this is so. For example, some approaches are very well-developed over a limited grade range. Sponsors of such approaches [e.g., Appalachia Educational Laboratory (HOPE-II), University of Illinois (PEECH)] need to extend their already-developed programs to other grades. Other sponsors have done very little developmental work at any grade level (e.g., the Governor's State University bilingual education approach has never been implemented), while still others have been implemented in only one site and lack some of the experience and materials to work in a number of districts (e.g, Carbondale New School, Antioch-New England, and Nova University).

By scanning across columns the reader can see the extent to which each of the program characteristics and implementation strategies have or have not been met by the group of potential new sponsors. For example, most potential sponsors have done at least some work in the areas of lesson preparation, specification of staff roles, specification of objectives, and development/selection of outcome measures. On the other hand, relatively little has been done by the potential new sponsors on providing guidelines for the selection of textbooks, continually assessing the degree to which the approach is meeting a district's needs, negotiating the use of non-achievement test outcomes with USOE, and obtaining ongoing feedback from districts.

In closing, we should note that the recommendations we make and the standards we set for potential new sponsors are not easy to meet. Many of them are included precisely because they are the areas in which the current Follow Through sponsors have traditionally had problems. We feel that if USOE is interested in funding new Follow Through approaches, the group of 18 sponsors with whom we have worked offer some excellent opportunities.

ABSTRACTS OF HOME-BASED APPROACHES

Three potential new sponsors have home-based approaches:

1) The Appalachia Educational Laboratory (HOPE-II),

2) Brigham Young University, and

3) The Cooperative Educational Service Agency (Portage).

The first two potential sponsors have served disadvantaged children in general, while the third targets handicapped children.

Approach: Home-Oriented Primary Education (HOPE-II)

Sponsor: Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc.
Charleston, West Virginia 25325

Contact Person: Edward E. Gotts (304)344-8371

Home-Oriented Primary Education (HOPE-II) is a school-based, home-oriented approach which is based on the belief that a child's learning takes place in three important environments--home, school and community. The HOPE-II process coordinates and unifies the learning potential of these settings. HOPE-II seeks to create a partnership between home and school in the preschool years and to continue this partnership throughout the early learning years. It also helps schools to build linkages with other community agencies which support family life and child development.

HOPE-II focuses on a broad spectrum of competencies, using them as a starting point to foster basic skills learning and for continuing social-emotional development. The HOPE-II program consists of five components: classroom, home visits, day care, parent discussion groups, and television. The Appalacia Educational Laboratory has developed and published a series of "Aids to Early Learning" instructional materials for classroom and home use.

The predecessor of HOPE-II (HOPE-I) was created in 1968 for preschool children in Appalachia who had no opportunity for formal preschool training. HOPE-II adapted and broadened the HOPE-I program to include kindergarten and first grade as well as preschool children, and will be field tested with second and third grade children in 1980. HOPE-II has been adopted in approximately 30 school systems in 15 states throughout the country, and particularly in 10 of the 13 Appalachian states.

Approach: Brigham Young University

Sponsor: Brigham Young University, Department of Child Development and Family Relationships
Provo, Utah 84602

Contact Persons: Dr. Terence D. Olson and Dr. Owen W. Cahoon
(801)374-1211 x 2069

The Brigham Young University (BYU) approach is based on the belief that skilled parent involvement, particularly in social-emotional development, is essential to a child's learning, especially during the early childhood years. The BYU approach postulates that cooperation between the parents and the school results in an optimal, total development/learning environment.

The curriculum consists of 24 lesson plans prepared for parents and keyed to a sponsor-produced workbook and 32 tape programs entitled "Brushing Up On Parenthood." The program involves the students, classroom teacher, the parents, and a home visitor who maintains contact with the parents through visits to the home between the monthly parent lessons. There is no classroom component to the BYU approach.

This approach is targeted for the general population of children in the kindergarten age range, i.e., 3 1/2 to 5 year olds. The BYU program has been implemented in two locations in somewhat different versions: (1) as a mandatory part of the BYU lab school nursery/kindergarten, and (2) within the Carbon County (65 miles south of Provo, Utah) public schools.

Approach: The Portage Project Home-Based Model
Sponsor: Cooperative Education Service Agency 12
Portage, Wisconsin 53901
Contact Person: Mr. David E. Shearer (608)742-5342

The Portage Project is a home teaching program designed to serve multi-categorical handicapped children from birth to six years of age, although it has also been implemented with older handicapped individuals (functioning at a 0 to 6 years level) and with normal and economically disadvantaged preschool and kindergarten children.

One of the fundamental premises of the Portage approach is that effective parent involvement is the main ingredient in long-term early childhood intervention. The home is considered the natural learning environment for the child. Portage Project has two main objectives: to help develop the full potential of the child, and to teach parents to be effective teachers of their children. The Project follows a developmental approach to education of the child, assessing her/his present skill level, and targeting emerging skills as the materials to be taught. The teaching strategies employed are dependent on developmental theory in breaking down long-term goals into sequential substeps which can be taught successfully in one week.

Portage has been in operation in south central Wisconsin since 1969. Since 1972, the approach has been replicated in over 45 sites nationwide. Under varying auspices, training and technical assistance have been provided to hundreds of other programs which have adopted parts of the approach or adapted or modified the approach to fit their own needs.

ABSTRACTS OF SCHOOL-BASED APPROACHES TARGETED TO SPECIAL POPULATIONS

Six potential new sponsors have school-based approaches that serve children from special populations:

1) The Central Institute for the Deaf,
2) Child, Youth and Family Services (DEAL),
3) Early Recognition Intervention Network (ERIN),
4) Governor's State University,
5) University of Illinois (PEECH), and
6) Ohio State University (Directive Teaching).

Approach: Early Education Parent Infant Language Training Program
Sponsor: Central Institute for the Deaf
St. Louis, Missouri 63110
Contact Person: Dr. Audrey Simmons-Martin (314)652-3200

The Central Institute for the Deaf (CID) Early Education Parent Language Training Program addresses the needs of children under six years of age who are language delayed and/or have hearing impairments. The primary goal of this program is to initiate procedures that foster the acquisition of receptive and expressive oral language. A basic premise underlying this approach is that hearing-impaired children need the same kind of interaction with parents and other family members as hearing children, but that they need more intensive interaction and direct instruction. Thus, the CID Early Education approach grows directly out of theoretical and empirical research on normal child development processes.

The CID Program includes two components: the Parent-Infant Program and the pre-primary nursery program. All of the curriculum materials and instructions are designed to help parents improve their general parenting skills and to understand normal child developmental processes, hearing, hearing impairments and hearing aids so that they become their own child's teacher, making use of everyday occurrences in their homes. In a home-like physical setting, the CID Program trains teachers and parents to use these materials as vehicles to teach concepts and language as it is normally used.

The CID Early Education program serves hearing-impaired children from birth to six years of age from all racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic backgrounds. At present the approach has been adopted in sites in 32 states and in several other countries. However, this adoption has been primarily in private institutions and university affiliated schools because of the lack of enabling legislation in states which would provide funds to assist with the education of handicapped children from birth until school age.

Approach: Dual Educational Approach to Learning (DEAL)

Sponsor: Child, Youth and Family Services
Los Angeles, California 90057

Contact Person: Bea Gold (213)386-7780

The Dual Educational Approach to Learning (DEAL) is a program developed for the education of handicapped students. The approach assumes that no single approach to learning will meet the needs of all teachers, parents, and children. The DEAL program was therefore designed to provide handicapped students with the opportunity for a flexible and balanced educational experience. In contrast to some other programs for the handicapped, the educational philosophy of DEAL is based on developmental learning theories, rather than behavior modification or remedial educational principles.

The sponsor's objectives include basic skills development, the development of self-concept, and an active parent participation program. These objectives are attained through the organization of classroom and parent activities. DEAL is designed to use the existing basic skills curricula of adopting schools.

DEAL has been implemented since 1970 in the Sophia T. Salvin school, a public school in Los Angeles devoted to the education of handicapped students, preschool through sixth grade. The Salvin school is also the center of a replication and training effort which helps to disseminate all or part of the DEAL program to teachers, parents, and interested persons from Head Start agencies, public school children centers, public and private schools.

Approach: Early Recognition Intervention Network (ERIN)

Sponsor: Early Recognition Intervention Network
Dedham, Mass. 02026

Contact Person: Peter Hainsworth (617)329-5529

The Early Recognition Intervention Network (ERIN) is a comprehensive technology for matching the needs of young handicapped students with an appropriate educational environment. ERIN helps teachers integrate such children into mainstream early childhood/primary programs as well as teach more severely handicapped children in special classroom/home-based programs. While it includes specific curriculum components, it is primarily a way of organizing and extending an existing program to be more atuned to the special needs and learning styles of handicapped students. Consequently, ERIN places an emphasis on child and classroom assessment, and has developed a broad range of evaluation instruments to be used by teachers and specialists in the classroom.

ERIN staff are concerned with the handicapped students' development of skills in three areas: (1) participation and social skills; (2) information processing skills--which include body awareness and control, visual-perceptual-motor skills, and language skills; and (3) symbolizing skills--including language arts and math ability.

ERIN has been adopted for use primarily with handicapped students in Rhode Island public preschools. Fifteen Massachusetts early childhood and kindergarten sites implemented ERIN from 1975-78, and current work focuses on participation in the BEH Outreach and Personnel Preparation Projects replication efforts in seven Massachusetts sites and site clusters in Rhode Island, Connecticut, New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, and Puerto Rico.

Approach: Governor's State University Bilingual/Bicultural Education Program

Sponsor: Governor's State University
College of Human Learning and Development
Park Forest, South Illinois 60466

Contact Person: Dr. Vinicio Reyes (312)534-5000

The Governor's State University Bilingual/Bicultural Education Program is a model for training teachers and administrators for bilingual/bicultural education programs. Its administrators and faculty have worked closely with the Chicago public school districts and other school districts as a means to provide practicum experience for university students and to assist school districts in complying with state and local laws requiring bilingual/bicultural education.

The philosophy and goals of the professional training programs are integrated with the sponsor's ultimate goal of providing a comprehensive bilingual/bicultural education program. The sponsor believes that teachers and administrators must be bilingual in Spanish and English in order to implement sound and effective bilingual programs.

This approach has not been formally implemented as a bilingual/bicultural education program for children. Governor's State University defines its role of serving the Latin community in terms of program development leading to certification of Latino educators and administrators. The Bilingual/Bicultural Program works closely with six LEAs that are nearby or adjacent to the University.

Approach: Precise Early Education of Children with Handicaps (PEECH)

Sponsor: University of Illinois
Institute for Child Behavior and Development
Champaign, Illinois 61820

Contact Person: Dr. Merle B. Karnes (217)333-4890

The Precise Early Education of Children with Handicaps (PEECH) approach was developed as a model preschool program for the total education of multiply-handicapped children ages 3-5. The PEECH philosophy specifies several characteristics as being necessary for the effective education of handicapped/ disadvantaged children: (1) an effective educational program must provide a structured learning environment for individualized instruction based on stages of development; (2) language and information processing skills are critical to all further development; (3) the family should be involved in the educational process; and (4) teaching should be game-oriented and make consistent use of positive reinforcement.

The overall objective of PEECH is to assist each child in developing her/his full educational potential (1) by promoting cognitive, social, emotional and motor development and the acquisition of effective language and information processing skills, motivation conducive to learning, and a positive self-concept; (2) by encouraging parental participation; and (3) by enhancing (educational) staff competencies.

From 1970 to 1979, PEECH has been implemented in over 100 settings (including Head Start, day care, and public and private preschools) with preschool handicapped children. Curriculum materials and activities and assessment instruments have been and are being extended to include older children.

Approach: Directive Teaching Model (D-T)

Sponsor: The Ohio State University
Academic Faculty for Exceptional Children
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Contact Person: Thomas M. Stephens (614)422-8787

The Directive Teaching (D-T) approach is a structured instructional system based on the principles of behavior modification, reinforcement theory, feedback theory and cybernetics. The D-T philosophy stresses the importance of consistent and systematic reinforcement and role modeling within the child's learning environment.

The program's primary goal is to teach basic skills--reading, mathematics and social skills. To meet this goal the sponsor has developed a highly structured instructional management system. Teachers are taught specific skills which enable them to be effective in academic and social instruction while simultaneously responding to classroom management concerns.

Parents are encouraged to support the child's learning by providing positive reinforcement and role models within the home. By being involved in goal setting and internalizing controls learned through parent and teacher supplied reinforcements, the child learns self-management as well as basic academic skills.

The D-T approach has been implemented in kindergarten through high school level classrooms and in diverse learning environments. Economically disadvantaged students formed a majority of the target populations in the Baltimore inner city schools, in the Thurber school in Columbus Ohio, and among the Lakota Sioux in South Dakota. In Ohio, D-T has experienced broader exposure and provided extensive teacher training services.

ABSTRACTS OF SCHOOL-BASED APPROACHES SERVING DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN

Nine potential new sponsors have school-based approaches that are targeted to the general population of disadvantaged children:

1) Antioch, New England,
2) Carbondale New School,
3) Central Washington University,
4) Los Angeles Unified School District (LBC),
5) University of Minnesota (PBEC),
6) Monongalia County Board of Education,
7) State University of New York at Oswego (CAM),
8) Nova University, and
9) Virginia Commonwealth University (Developmental Instruction).

Approach: Antioch-New England

Sponsor: Antioch-New England Graduate School/Harrisville School
Keene, New Hampshire 03431

Contact Person: David Sobel (603)357-3122

The Antioch-New England approach is a synthesis of the program at the Harrisville School and the preservice and inservice education which exist in Antioch-New England's Elementary Education and Developmental Teacher Consultant programs. This approach is grounded in developmental psychology and its curriculum reflects the belief that a child's affective and cognitive growth follow well delineated sequential stages.

At the Harrisville School children express themselves through dance, visual arts, three-dimensional modeling and sign language as well as the conventional means of mathematics and writing. Accentuating the uniqueness of each individual and fostering productivity, confidence, self-direction, discipline and problem solving are major concerns of the sponsor.

The Antioch-New England program has been tested for seven years at the Harrisville School located in Harrisville, New Hampshire, and serves children aged 4-9 from pre-K through third grade. The student population includes average children, low-income children, and children with special needs--including physically handicapped, mildly mentally retarded, emotionally disturbed, learning disabled and gifted.

Approach: Carbondale New School

Sponsor: Carbondale New School
Carbondale, Illinois 62901

Contact Person: Janice Kurtz-Weiss (618)457-4765

This approach is sponsored and implemented by the Carbondale New School (CNS), an alternative private school. The school was founded by a group of parents, primarily Southern Illinois University (SIU) faculty who were dissatisfied with the Carbondale public schools and whose children would have attended the University lab school, had it remained open. Thus, the CNS philosophy is simply to provide an alternative to public education.

The CNS approach teaches to the curriculum objectives used by the public schools, and uses standard basal texts as the instructional core for all subject areas. The CNS instructional process, including presentation of the curriculum, requires (1) flexibility, (2) ongoing experimentation with instructional methods, (3) almost one-to-one individualized instruction, and (4) immediate response and adjustment to the individual child.

This approach has been implemented in one site, the Carbondale New School, in grades K-8. Roughly two-thirds of the students are from families connected with SIU. Although a small number of students are on scholarship, the majority are from middle and upper-middle socioeconomic backgrounds.

Approach: Central Washington University Children's School

Sponsor: Central Washington University
Washington Center for Early Childhood Education
Ellensburg, Washington 98926

Contact Person: Jacqueline T. Bates (509)963-1601

The Central Washington University Children's School (CWU) functions as part of the Washington Center for Early Childhood Education, which is primarily a program to train early childhood education teachers. The educational program implemented by CWU in the Children's School is a modified language experience curriculum combined with an emphasis on encouraging children to make choices and to express these choices through the vehicle of play. This approach is child-centered in nature, with important influence coming from open education, the British Infant Schools, and from child development theory.

The CWU program focuses on the child's development of basic skills and fosters the parents' participation in this process. Classroom materials include existing curricula and teacher-made activities. The instructional program includes: language, computational skills, perceptual-motor skills, the physical environment, human and societal studies, creative language and movement, art, and music. Parents are involved in the classroom as volunteers and as aides and through participation in the Parent Advisory Committee.

The target population of this program is all children. The CWU program has been implemented within the lab school setting, where about one third of the students fall below the poverty level. No other replications or field tests have been conducted.

Approach: Linguistics of the Black Child (LBC)

Sponsor: Educational Linguistics Inc.
Los Angeles City Unified School District
Project Follow-Through
Los Angeles, California 90019

Contact Person: Howard M. Holt (213)749-7501

Linguistics of the Black Child (LBC) is an approach to education using a linguistic (language) difference concept. This concept infuses linguistic strategies into the existing school affective and cognitive curricula. Emphasis is placed upon social interaction, personality adjustment, the language arts experiences within the classroom environment and relates to the Black child's communication style as it develops from the home to the school community. The linguistic approach provides continuity in the child's communication and self-expression skills in kindergarten through third grades. It further provides a foundation for the child to make the transfer from his dialect to standard language, a process that is crucial to his academic as well as personality adjustment in an educational setting.

The philosophy of LBC addresses both the cultural ("sociolinguistic") and the educational ("psycholinguistic") needs of the children it serves. Underlying the cultural aspect of the philosophy is the belief that one must accept the speech patterns, affective state, and past cultural experiences the child brings into the classroom. The educational philosophy of the program emphasizes oral language and cognitive development.

LBC is currently implemented as a FT approach in 14 classrooms distributed across 8 Los Angeles schools. Two classrooms are primarily Hispanic, and there are non-Black students in all of the others. Although the LBC approach currently concentrates on the linguistic problems of Black students, the sponsor does not maintain that Black children are the only target population.

Approach: Primary Basic Experience Curriculum (PBEC)

Sponsor: University of Minnesota College of Education
Department of Curriculum and Instruction
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

Contact Person: Harlan S. Hansen (612)373-2285

The Primary Basic Experience Curriculum (PBEC) approach provides an alternative to the traditional modes of presenting kindergarten through third grade curricula. The theoretical and philosophical basis of PBEC is eclectic, representing a synthesis of the work of numerous philosophers and educators, and findings from empirical research in child development, learning processes in early childhood, and educational practices.

PBEC emphasizes basic skills (reading, mathematics, spelling, handwriting, etc.), which are formally taught in the traditional manner established by school districts, for one hour each day. However, the PBEC approach is designed to integrate teaching of the basic skills into all other curriculum areas and to establish a one-to-one correspondence between classroom activities and the world outside. This is accomplished by adapting curriculum materials to the problem solving and inquiry approach, establishing a structured daily schedule which ensures that all curriculum areas are covered each day, and maintaining a classroom environment structured according to the sponsor's guidelines. Parent and community involvement are also essential elements of this program.

The approach has been implemented in kindergarten through the third grade in two two St.Paul-Minneapolis schools (and through the fourth grade in one school), which serve heterogeneous racial, ethnic and socioeconomic populations. The approach is currently being extended through the sixth grade.

Approach: Comprehensive Achievement Monitoring Model (CAM)

Sponsor: State University of New York at Oswego,
College of Arts and Sciences
Oswego, New York 13126

Contact Persons: Lawrence A. Kiley and John J. Reading (315)341-2264

The Oswego Comprehensive Achievement Monitoring Model (CAM) is a fully operational approach to managing instruction, and has been formally adopted by a school board and district administration. The sponsor's philosophy is that a systems approach to the management of instruction will produce the most effective instructional environment. The CAM approach allows many valid approaches to instruction and encourages teacher creativity and decision-making. It focuses on indiviidualized instructional diagnosis for the students while preserving a high degree of prescriptive autonomy and flexibility for the individual teacher and principal.

The CAM approach encompasses both reading (grades K-8) and math (grades 2-8). Aside from the instructional objectives and related criterion-referenced tests for each grade level, there are no system-specific subject matter or materials. CAM is a classroom instructional approach which makes use of whatever curriculum the adopting district, school, or teacher wishes to teach and whatever materials are available. By choice, the sponsor has not extended the math component downward into grades K-1. At these grade levels, children do not receive math instruction as such, but rather concentrate on a variety of math readiness activities and conceptual learning, most of which is picked up in the reading component.

CAM has been implemented in five elementary schools and one middle school for the past three years. These schools serve a range of children including the economically disadvantaged, specifically, Title I children.

Approach: Monongalia County Follow Through

Sponsor: Monongalia County Board of Education
Morgantown, West Virginia 26505

Contact Persons: Barbara Starcher and Marie Alsop (304)296-8261

Monongalia County Follow Through (MCFT) coordinates school, family, and community resources in an effort to serve the "whole child" through new instructional approaches, health and social services, parent involvement, and extensive staff development. Based on the belief that children are individuals, differing in development physically, socially, emotionally, and intellectually, this approach seeks to give children the best possible chance to grow in these areas.

Instructional methods emphasize the basic skills and go beyond this to foster the attitudes and build the skills that make learning an adventure and enhance the child's development of a positive self concept. One of the essential elements of the MCFT instructional program is the implementation of a diagnostic approach to reading programs designed and developed by its teachers and staff--the Comprehensive Approach to Individualized Reading.

With the support and endorsement of the Monongalia County Board of Education, MCFT has functioned as a self-sponsored FT site. The MCFT approach has been in operation in 11 classrooms within three schools since 1969. The three schools are located in Morgantown, West Virginia: one within the city and two in outlying rural areas. Approximately 275 children, at least half from low-income families, are served by this FT program in first through third grade.

Approach: The University School

Sponsor: Nova University
Ft. Lauderdale, Florida 33314

Contact Person: Leonard A. Tomasello (305)583-6185

The NOVA approach is based on a personalized learning philosophy and on the assumption that all students are creative and should be treated as "gifted" pupils. The purpose of the approach is to motivate the students to assert their creativity through basic skills. Therefore, the sponsor's objectives include the development of basic skills and their integration into classroom activities which reinforce these basic skills in a creative manner.

The University School is student-centered and individualizes learning activities around interest centers in the school and in the community. Its success is based on the commitment of all phases of its school program to fostering a continuing positive interaction between itself and the community.

The approach has been implemented in the lab school (the University School) of Nova University (preK-12) since 1971. At present, the school's K-3 component includes 12 teachers serving 230 students, 20 of whom are Head Start pupils. Most of the students are supported by tuition; 30 non-tuition pupils are supported by Head Start and the school.

Approach: The Developmental Instructional Model (DI)

Sponsor: Virginia Commonwealth University
Department of Elementary Education
Richmond, Virginia 23284

Contact Person: Joan Fulton (804)257-1324

The Developmental Instruction Model (DI) is an instructional approach which seeks to combine the Piagetian cognitive theory and language development theories. DI structures the process by which students learn in order to teach thinking processes or cognitive skills as well as the usual basic skills. The basic skills, while important in themselves, are seen as vehicles for teaching the cognitive skills. DI focuses on the instruction of classroom teachers rather than the direct instruction of children. It provides the teachers with the framework by which they can organize their daily instruction and develop appropriate basic skills and cognitive skills tasks.

DI focuses on the curriculum areas of reading, language arts, and math; it could be applied to other curriculum areas such as science or social studies. The DI approach can be applied to whatever reading, language arts, and math programs or curricula an adopting school system or school has chosen to implement.

The DI approach has been developed to target disadvantaged low achievers, specifically, Title I-type children, in grades K-6. It has been field tested in one Title I school in Henrico County, Virginia, for one school year (1978-79). DI will continue to be implemented in this school in 1979-80 and will also be introduced into two additional sites--a rural school in Virginia, and a private church-related school.